REMARKS

1.   Applicant thanks the Examiner for his findings, conclusions, and for pointing out the allowable subject matter of Claims 10-14, 16-26, and 29-34.

5

2.   It should be appreciated that Applicant has elected to amend Claim 1 solely for the purpose of expediting the patent process in a manner consistent with the PTO's Patent Business Goals, 65 Fed. Reg. 54603 (9/8/00). In making such amendment, Applicant has not and does not in any way narrow the scope

10   of protection to which the Applicant considers the invention herein entitled. Rather, Applicant reserves Applicant's right to pursue such protection at a later point in time and merely seeks to pursue protection for the subject matter presented in this submission.

15   <u>Hilton Davis / Festo Statement</u>

Amendments herein to Claim 1 was not made for any reason related to patentability. Changes to Claim 1 were implemented to clarify the invention and to conform with standard claim drafting practices. The foregoing amendment is not related to the pending rejection; the amendment was made for reasons other

20   than patentability.

3.   Claims 10-14, 16-26, and 29-34 stand objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim.

Claims 10-14, 16-26, and 29-34 are either written in independent form or depend

25   from either independent Claim 10 or Independent Claim 25. Accordingly, Claims 10-14, 16-26, and 29-34 are deemed to be in allowable format.

10

4.   Claims 1-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. patent no. 6,484,177 (hereinafter "Van Huben").

As to Claim 1, Applicant respectfully disagrees. Claim 1 was amended in the
5   prior office action to limit. the step of organizing the directory views into a hierarchy using <u>only</u> information concerning the entries. Applicant can find no teaching or description anywhere in Van Huben that only the information concerning the entries is used in organizing the directory view. In stark contrast, as the Examiner has stated, <u>Van Huben is describing a structure that can</u>
10   <u>encompass two types of data</u>, files and directory entries. No suggestion is made in Van Huben that the structure containing the two data types is made using information within the files and directory entries. Van Huben is directed at a structure containing two types of data, while in stark contrast the claimed invention is directed at a method of organizing the directory views based upon
15   information within the data. Accordingly, the rejection of Claim 1 and all claims dependent therefrom under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Van Huben is deemed to be improper.

In order to still further distinguish Claim 1 from the cited art, Applicant amends
20   Claim 1 to clarify that <u>each of the directory views belongs to a specific object</u> <u>class that contains a filter attribute, where the filter attribute contains a filter that</u> <u>describes the directory view</u>. Support for the amendment is found at least in allowable Claim 10 of the application. Accordingly, the rejection of Claim 1 and all claims dependent therefrom under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by
25   Van Huben is deemed to be overcome.

5.   New Claims 35-38 are added to the Application. Support for the new Claims 35, 36, 37, and 38 is found in Claims 10, 19, 19, and 25, respectively. Additional support for Claims 35-38 is found in the published application at

11

Application Serial No. 10/051,065

paragraphs 0019-0026. Applicant certifies that no new matter was added by way
of the new claims.

12

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, the Application is deemed to be in allowable condition. The Examiner is therefore earnestly requested to withdraw all outstanding rejections

5 and objections, allowing the Application to pass to issue as a United States Patent. Should the Examiner have any questions regarding the application, he is respectfully urged to contact Applicant's attorney at (650) 474-8400.

Respectfully submitted,

10

Michael A. Glenn

Reg. No. 30, 176

Customer No. 22,862

15

13